

EDUARD SCHWEIZER

DYING AND RISING WITH CHRIST

The relation of the so-called 'mystical' to the so-called 'juridical' aspect of Paul's theology has been frequently discussed. While Albert Schweitzer thought that the doctrine of justification by faith was no more than a 'side-crater' in the Pauline theology, Rudolf Bultmann considered the idea of a participation in the destiny of Christ a Gnostic influence not really fitting into the Pauline pattern of thought.¹ This disagreement is not of merely historical interest; behind it lies the central theological problem of the significance of Jesus' life, death and resurrection for us today. Is this significance to be expressed in the categories of an example to be followed or a forerunner, who opens the way ahead for us, or are the categories of sacrificial or vicarious death more adequate? At first sight, the two patterns seem to contradict each other. According to the first, the believer dies with Christ; Christ's death becomes the believer's death; according to the second, Christ dies under the curse of divine judgement, lest the believer undergo this judgement. However, the first observation that we make in the Pauline texts is the coincidence of both lines in the same sentence: II Cor. v. 14: 'One has died for all; therefore all have died'; I Thess. v. 10: 'Christ died for us so that whether we wake or sleep we might live with him.'²

We may add I Cor. vi. 11, where God's Spirit, effective in baptism, is connected with the concept of justification and forgiveness of sins: 'You let yourselves be washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.' It might, therefore, be worth while trying anew to investigate Paul's conception of living 'with Christ' and its connexion with other parts of his theology. I shall suggest that, if we start from Paul's eschatology, that will elucidate the fundamental unity of both patterns.

I. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL BEING 'WITH CHRIST'

A first group of sayings offers no great difficulties. Being 'with Christ' describes the coming life after the parousia of Christ in I Thess. iv. 17 and II Cor. xiii. 4³ (compare also Rom. vi. 8b; Col. iii. 4). Phil. i. 23 ('What I

¹ A. Schweitzer, *Die Mystik des Apostel Paulus* (Tübingen, 1930), p. 220. Cf. R. Bultmann, *Theologie des N.T.* ch. 33, 3-5. The most recent and very helpful discussion of this problem is to be found in R. C. Tannehill, 'Dying and Rising with Christ', Beiheft ZNW, xxxii (1966). Cf. also W. Thüsing, 'Per Christum in Deum', *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, N.F. 1 (1965), and E. Güttgemanns, *Der leidende Apostel und sein Herr* (1966), also E. Schweizer, *Ev. Theol.* 26 (1966), pp. 239-57.

² Cf. Tannehill (*op. cit.* note 1), pp. 69, 133f., who also refers to Phil. iii. 2-11 (p. 115).

³ Cf. note 5, p. 2.

should like is to depart and be with Christ') is not really different.¹ Chapter iii. 20f.,² in the same letter, proves that Paul is still expecting the parousia of Christ in the near future. Being imprisoned, he realistically considers the possibility of being executed, and he knows that the 'being with Christ' which will characterize the final state of beatitude after the parousia will also determine any possible interval between death and resurrection. Paul probably never reflected on the question, whether this will be a time of unconsciousness which passes in the twinkling of an eye or a kind of peaceful sleep in the hands of Christ.³

I Thess. iv. 14, although different, does not pose great problems either. Paul expects that God will bring the deceased 'with Christ' at his parousia, so that the believer will, even at the parousia itself, not only be with Christ, but share his destiny. This, however, corresponds with the Old Testament and Jewish passages to which, as Dupont showed, this group of eschatological sayings goes back. It is the Old Testament image of the Lord's epiphany with his saints, and more specifically its further developed form in post-biblical Judaism. So we read in I Enoch i. 9: 'He (God) will come with myriads of his saints', and especially in lxii. 14: 'And they shall eat, lie down and rise with that son of man.' It is important to observe that Paul speaks of sharing 'with Christ' only in the apocalyptic context of the parousia, whereas, in speaking of the death of the believer, he uses 'through Christ': 'God will bring with Jesus those who have fallen asleep through him.'⁴

This shows that the formula 'with Christ' describes, in the Pauline letters, the final being with him after his parousia, similarly to I Enoch lxii. 14, but also, parallel to I Enoch i. 9 and Old Testament phrases, the believer's participation in the event of the parousia, in which he shares the destiny of Christ.

That the eschatological meaning of the expression 'with Christ' is the original one is also proved by II Cor. xiii. 4: 'We are weak *in* Christ, but shall live *with* him.'⁵ This former phrase corresponds with the frequent formula 'in Christ' that describes the earthly life of the member of the church, the latter is the eschatological formula. In a similar way, Paul declares that we are given over to death 'because of Jesus', but shall be raised 'with Christ' (II Cor. iv. 11, 14). This is buttressed by I Thess. v. 10, where Paul speaks of Christ's dying for us and our life with him. Unfortunately, the interpretation of this latter expression is debatable. If Paul means that, whether living or dead at the moment, we shall, after the parousia, live with

¹ Pace J. Dupont, *Σὺν Χριστῷ, L'union avec le Christ suivant St Paul*, 1 (1952), pp. 172–81.

² Considered as a fragment of a pre-Pauline hymn by Güttgemanns (cf. note 1, p. 1), pp. 240f.

³ The same idea is probably expressed as early as I Thess. v. 10, cf. below.

⁴ Cf. Dupont (cf. note 1), p. 42; the New English Bible against RSV; and Thüsing (cf. note 1, p. 1), p. 202.

⁵ Some manuscripts read 'with Christ', some also 'in him'; but the rendering given above represents probably the correct reading. Cf. Tannehill (cf. note 1, p. 1), 99, n. 1.

Christ, it is just one more instance of an apocalyptic usage. However, after iv. 18 Paul is finished with the argument about the deceased sharing the parousia of Christ with the still living members of the church. From v. 1 on, he stresses the ethical point that expecting the near parousia leads to a new life in faith, love and hope. Thus, verse 10 more probably means that, whether we are living or dead, we are 'with Christ', because he has died for us.¹ If this be so, Paul, as early as I Thess., extended the meaning of the formula 'to be with Christ' from describing the apocalyptic life after the parousia even further back than in iv. 14: namely to a description of the period between death and parousia and even to that of the earthly life of the Christian. The former is a perfect parallel to Phil. i. 23, the latter is closely paralleled by Rom. xiv. 8f., where, however, in the Greek text 'to be of the Lord' (namely: the property of the Lord) replaces 'to be with Christ', because Paul stresses here the Lordship of Christ and the obedience of the faithful. A similar passage is Rom. viii. 32. That God 'will grant us everything with Christ' relates, probably, in the view of the context viii. 17–30 and of the reference to the last judgement in v. 33, primarily to the still outstanding eschatological beatitude but may, in some vague way, also describe the situation of the believer before the parousia.

II. BAPTISM AS ANTICIPATION OF ESCHATOLOGICAL LIFE

Is it possible that the formulas which speak of the dying with Christ as something which has already happened are to be explained as a similar extension of the apocalyptic formula? The first fact which should be noted is that the formula 'with Christ' occurs only in either apocalyptic or baptismal contexts. This is undoubtedly true for the very formula 'with Christ' which, apart from the apocalyptic passages already discussed, is to be found exclusively where Paul deals with baptism, namely Rom. vi. 8 and Col. ii. 13, 20 and iii. 3f. (whether written by himself or by one of his disciples); in all instances it is closely connected with apocalyptic statements. Even when we turn to verbs composed with the preposition σύν ('with'), the situation is not much different. Phil. iii. 21 stands in an apocalyptic context, Eph. ii. 5f. definitely uses apocalyptic language, although speaking of what has already happened to the Christian, probably in baptism. Rom. vi. 4–8 and Col. ii. 12f.; iii. 1 clearly describe baptism. For Gal. ii. 20 the same may be true, although Paul uses the perfect tense in order to emphasize the continuing validity of what happened once in baptism. 'I have been crucified with Christ'.² The imagery of man becoming anew the image of God in Rom.

¹ To be sure, the verb is in the aorist (Tannehill [cf. note 1, p. 1], pp. 133f., who interprets therefore in the former sense); however, exactly the same is true for Rom. vi. 4c.

² R. Schnackenburg, *Das Heilsgeschehen bei der Taufe nach dem Apostel Paulus* (Münchener Theol. Studien, hist. Abt. 1 [1950]), pp. 57–60.

viii. 29f. shows also that Paul thinks probably of baptism.¹ Thus, only Rom. viii. 17; Phil. iii. 10 and II Tim. ii. 11f. are different. All three passages declare that the apocalyptic glorification with Christ includes and presupposes a preceding suffering with Christ. All three passages combine a reference to the baptismal experience of receiving the spirit of sonship (Rom. viii. 15f.) or dying with Christ (Phil. iii. 10, cf. 8f. and II Tim. ii. 11) with the concept of daily suffering with Christ.² This is also mentioned in II Cor. iv. 10f., where, however, the phrase 'with Christ' is lacking, and, without any direct reference to Christ, in Rom. viii. 36, I Cor. xv. 30. Let us therefore turn to the understanding of baptism in the New Testament.

The baptism of John was undoubtedly shaped by a vivid expectation of the impending doomsday. It was probably more, even the anticipation of the imminent judgement by fire, saving the penitent, who underwent it voluntarily, from future damnation.³

Despite all differences Christian baptism stands historically and theologically in close relation to the rite of John.⁴ This is especially true for the eschatological connotation. We start from the word of Jesus (Mark x. 15), which promises entry into the (coming?) kingdom of God to whosoever receives it like a child. Probably this saying had been related to baptism very early. Cullmann⁵ has pointed to the formula 'do not hinder them' in v. 14, which occurs also in early Christian baptismal liturgies from Acts viii. 36 on. Ferdinand Hahn⁶ thinks that the position of this pericope in Mark x may reflect an early catechism dealing with marriage, baptism and Christian life. Be this as it may, John iii. 5 ('Unless one is born of water and spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God') shows at any rate a tradition which understood this saying in the light of Christian baptism. The formulation 'to enter into the kingdom of God', totally foreign to John, who nowhere else speaks of the kingdom of God, proves that he quotes a traditional sentence. It is identical with the phrase used in Mark x. 15. This proves that the child-like receiving of the kingdom in the subordinate clause of Mark x. 15 has been interpreted by the early church in the light of its baptism as 'being born from water and spirit'.

Thus, in the interpretation of the pre-Johannine church, baptism, understood as a rebirth by water and spirit, guaranteed entry into the coming kingdom of God. John himself uses the same phrase in a different way. No

¹ The idea of man becoming, through Christ, the image of God is for Thüsing (cf. note 1, p. 1), pp. 122-4, etc. the key to understanding man's participation in the life of the Risen Lord. Cf. also note 2, p. 11 below.

² I agree with Tannehill (cf. note 1, p. 1), pp. 7-14, 41-3, etc. that the baptismal context in Rom. vi belongs to a pre-Pauline tradition and that, on the whole, Paul himself does not emphasize baptism in most of the passages quoted above. Cf. note 1, p. 1.

³ H. G. Marsh, *The Origin and Significance of New Testament Baptism* (1941), p. 28; C. H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist* (1951), pp. 117f. Cf. also T. Gnllka, *Revue de Qumrân*, III (1961), pp. 204f.

⁴ Kraeling, pp. 171-5.

⁵ O. Cullmann, *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (1966), pp. 529f.

⁶ In a mimeographed paper: *Die Kindertaufe im ältesten Christentum* (1965), pp. 4f.

longer does he expect a coming kingdom;¹ for him, it is, at least primarily, a present reality, which the believer is already able to see. Moreover, he accepts baptism as an ecclesiastical rite, but is not much interested in it and therefore drops all allusions to it in the remaining parts of the pericope iii. 1–21. Thus, his own reformulation is to be found in v. 3: ‘Unless one is born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God.’ According to his understanding, birth from above, in the church connected with the rite of baptism, brings the kingdom of God. In it, what the apocalypticists expected from a future parousia, already happens. To say it in the terms of the Pauline eschatology: baptism brings the eschatological being with Christ. As I Thess. iv. 14 stated that God will give the deceased their share in the parousia of Christ, John states that in baptism God lets the believer share in the destiny of Christ, that he will not only be ‘brought with Christ’ in the parousia, but that he is already living with him.

Is John the first one with such an understanding? Certainly not. Even in the time of Paul, the Corinthians thought themselves to live in the new aeon, in the promised kingdom (I Cor. iv. 8), speaking in new tongues (xiii. 1 f.; xiv. 27), irresistibly moved by God’s spirit (xii. 2; xiv. 32), no longer expecting resurrection from the dead (xv. 12). It was not that they were denying the existence of a life after death, as Paul misunderstood them (I Cor. xv. 12, 32). If this were so, they would not have let themselves be baptized for the dead (xv. 29). Rather they thought, like Hymenaeus and Philetas in later times (II Tim. ii. 18), that the resurrection had already happened so that the life of the soul would go on eternally after the death of the body.² In Col. i. 13, the term ‘kingdom’, which is very rare in the Pauline letters, turns up again. The close resemblance of verses 12–14 to Acts xxvi. 18 and to Qumran texts proves that we deal here with traditional liturgical phrases. The context is that of conversion, referring to the participation in the lot of the holy ones, in the light; to the salvation from the power of darkness; to the forgiveness of sins, and finally to the ‘son of his love’, which reminds us of the baptism of Jesus (Mark i. 11).³ Most interesting is the assertion that the baptized are saved from the power of darkness and already transferred into the kingdom of Christ. This kingdom is no longer a future reality to be hoped for; it is present, and the believers are now living in it. This means that Col. i. 13, like John iii. 5, expresses exactly the belief which we hypothetically pre-

¹ I should not say that he expects nothing from the future, but certainly not the kingdom of God in the old sense which this connotation has in the Synoptists. I think that v. 28 f.; vi. 51–8; xii. 48 d are traditional sentences or phrases taken up by the evangelist, but cf., in his own language, xi. 25 f.; xii. 25; xiv. 3; xvii. 24.

² For a modern variant of this thesis, cf. Güttgemanns (cf. note 1, p. 1), pp. 67–93; his presupposition that a fully developed myth of the Saviour’s identity with the saved people was known in Corinth still seems to me a hypothesis without evidence.

³ It might be that this expression was borrowed from a first line of the hymn quoted in i. 15–20; for H. Wildberger has shown in *Theologische Zeitschrift*, xxi (1965), 500 that it occurs rather frequently in Egyptian texts (up to the time of the New Testament) together with the concept of the image of God (v. 15). For the meaning of baptism cf. n. 5, p. 7; n. 1, p. 14.

supposed for the history of the phrase 'with Christ': baptism is the anticipation of the change of the aeons; by it the believer is transferred into the coming kingdom, into the eschatological life with Christ. The apocalyptic expectation of such a life with Christ may also explain why Col. i. 13 speaks of Christ's, not of God's, kingdom.

There is another, even more suggestive, text: Tit. iii. 5. Here baptism is called 'the bath of rebirth'. The term 'rebirth', however, is not the usual one for 'being reborn' known from popular Greek philosophers, occasionally also from mystery religions: it is the term which occurs in the New Testament only once again, namely in Matt. xix. 28: 'In the rebirth (of the whole world) when the son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you...will also sit on twelve thrones...'

This term, in Stoic usage, describes the rebirth of the whole cosmos after the cosmic fire,¹ sometimes also the rebirth of man after the cosmic cycle of 440 years.² Plutarch uses the word for the individual rebirth in mystery religions³ and occasionally the word occurs in a figurative sense.⁴ Judaism took it up in order to apply it to the apocalyptic rebirth of the new earth under a new heaven.⁵ Thus, in this certainly traditional liturgical phrase we find again a probably still apocalyptic terminology identifying baptism with the cosmic rebirth of Stoic or Jewish apocalypticism.

In the same verse baptism is called the 'renewal of the Holy Spirit', which probably means the new, eschatological creation effected by God's Spirit. This is an expression of the common Christian belief that in the work of the Spirit given by baptism the coming aeon has broken into this present one. This is what, for instance, Heb. vi. 4f. clearly states: 'It is impossible to restore again to repentance those who have once been enlightened, who have tasted the heavenly gift, and have become partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted...the powers of the age to come...'

III. THE PAULINE INTERPRETATION OF DYING AND RISING WITH CHRIST

Let us turn to indisputably Pauline texts. The term 'kingdom of God', rare with Paul, as we said, is to be found in close connexion with baptism in I Cor. vi. 9–11.⁶ According to this passage baptism is carried out 'in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God', that is, in the

¹ *V. Armin.* II, 191; III, 265.

² *M. Ant.* II, 1; Terentius Varro (*Augustinus, Civ. Dei* 22, 28).

³ Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, I, 686, 8ff. (F. Büchsel); *Corp. Herm.* XIII, where it occurs ten times, is of a very late date.

⁴ Philon, *Post. Cain.* 124; Cicero, *Att.* 6; Josephus, *Ant.* II, 66; cf., in the second century A.D., Lucianus, *Enc. Mus.* 7 (the Platonic rebirth of the soul).

⁵ Cf. E. Sjöberg in *Studia Theol.* IV (1951), 60ff., also G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (1962), p. 238, n. 3. For a Hebrew parallel cf. 1QS 4, 25 (J. Dupont, *Biblica* 45, p. 365).

⁶ The middle voice means 'to let oneself be washed' (Schnackenburg [cf. note 2, p. 3], pp. 1f.; E. Lohse, *Taufe und Rechtfertigung bei Paulus, Kerygma und Dogma*, XI [1965], 322).

realm or in the sphere which is dominated by the exalted Christ and the living Spirit. The difficulty in which Paul finds himself is obvious. On the one hand, he wants to emphasize, contrary to the view of the Corinthians, that entry into the kingdom of God is a future fact and will be barred to adulterers, idolaters, etc. (*vv.* 9f.). On the other hand, he cannot deny that baptism means a real change. The old life in adultery, idolatry, etc., definitely came to an end, and entry into the coming kingdom of God was definitely given to them as a divine promise, when they were baptized. Hence, Paul solves the problem by asserting that dying to the old life of sin has already definitely happened in baptism, but rising to the final state of eternal life is still in the future. And yet, this is not all of the truth. In some way, this future life penetrates the still earthly existence of the baptized: the Spirit is present. II Cor. i. 21f. tries to do justice to this. The baptized¹ have been transferred 'into Christ', have been anointed and given the Spirit as a pledge, or according to Rom. viii. 23 as the first fruits of the coming eschatological gifts.² There are other Pauline texts showing a close connexion between baptism and apocalyptic hope, which can only be mentioned: Rom. viii. 29f.;³ xiii. 11–14⁴ and I Cor. x. 1–11 with its concept of a second eschatological exodus.⁵ It is clear: Paul fights against the Corinthian enthusiasm, an enthusiasm which leaves time and space behind it, by means of an understanding of baptism as the beginning of a way which leads to the final consummation; at the same time, he will not deny that in baptism the old aeon of sin has been ended definitely, and that in the Spirit the firstfruits of the coming life have been given to the church.

Let me summarize: Mark x. 15, John iii. 5 and I Cor. vi. 9–11 prove that baptism was understood in a broad area of the early church as giving admission to the kingdom of God. For Paul, and probably also for the tradition which was taken up by John, this was a future event promised and/or guaranteed by God to the baptized. For John, and even clearer for Col. i. 13 the seeing of God's kingdom, the transfer into Christ's kingdom has already been effected in baptism. Tit. iii. 5 shows even that this has probably been identified with the apocalyptic rebirth of the whole cosmos, which ends the old and initiates the new aeon, and the 'new creation' in II Cor. v. 17 may well be a relic of such apocalyptic views. I Cor. vi. 11 and Tit. iii. 5 prove that it was first of all the experience of the Spirit in and after baptism which led to such apocalyptic views. Heb. vi. 5 states explicitly that the baptized are

¹ Although 'sealing' is not yet a technical term for baptism (Schnackenburg, pp. 81–3), the passage deals probably with it and not only with the apostolic vocation (against Schnackenburg, pp. 84f.).

² Cf. II Cor. v. 5; Eph. i. 13f.

³ Cf. P. Stuhlmacher, *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus* (1965), pp. 186f.

⁴ Cf. the baptismal phrase 'to put on the Lord' (Gal. iii. 27) in *v.* 14, and Lohse (cf. n. 6, p. 6), p. 323.

⁵ Cf. the mention of baptism in *v.* 2 and J. Jeremias in Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch* iv p. 874. Again, the reference to baptism belongs, of course, to the tradition rather than to Paul himself (cf. note 2, p. 4 above). For Paul, baptism marks mainly the beginning of the new way of faith.

already tasting the powers of the future aeon; and Paul's corrections of a more enthusiastic understanding show that ideas of this kind were widespread and that the Corinthians understood the presence of the Spirit, not as a mere pledge or firstfruits like Paul, but as the new, eschatological life itself, as the apocalyptic 'living with Christ'. It seems fair to me to draw the conclusion that 'being with Christ' originally described the future life after the parousia of Christ. At the same time 'being brought' or 'coming with Christ' was what the baptized expected from that day on which he would share in Christ's triumph. Baptism was first conceived of as the divine promise or even God's guarantee for the participation in these coming events, for the entry into the kingdom of God. More and more it became the admission into the present kingdom of God or of Christ, and was understood as being raised with Christ to the life of the new aeon. The experience of the Spirit seemed to prove that the new aeon had in the church already broken into this world; resurrection was already an accomplished fact, since it had taken place in the rising with Christ in baptism. Against this enthusiasm, Paul emphasizes that the rising with Christ is still to be awaited. Asked whether, according to his preaching, nothing definite had happened in baptism, he would reply that indeed the dying to the old life of sin had definitely happened with Christ, into whose death they had been baptized. There was also a new life indeed, but in a paradoxical way. This life had to validate itself in the obedience of the believer. In the case of Paul himself, this led to imprisonment, scourging, defeat, death. And yet, even so, he knew himself to be going his way with Christ. It was 'suffering with Christ' (Rom. viii. 17) and at the same time 'walking in the newness of life' corresponding with Christ's resurrection (Rom. vi. 4). This new life, created in the midst of death, could already be seen in the revival of the congregations founded by Paul (II Cor. iv. 12) and would lead to the final glorification and the life 'with Christ' (Rom. vi. 8; viii. 17).¹

This scanty summary leads to the main question: how is the idea of this new life in obedience under the Lordship of Christ to be related to Paul's proclamation of justification by faith? If Christ died for us, why have we to die with him? Are we holy because of Christ's vicarious death or because of our new obedience, or is this a false alternative?

¹ Again, I agree with Tannehill's (cf. note 1, p. 1) statement that the idea of dying with Christ is different from that of living with Christ in or after the parousia (p. 88, n. 14), and that the former is rooted in pre-Pauline tradition (cf. note 2, p. 4 above). However, I am suggesting that the phrase 'with Christ' (with which Tannehill is not dealing, p. 6) originates in an apocalyptic view of the future life and was, before and independently of Paul, transferred to the area of ideas about a new life gained by baptism. On the other hand, baptism was traditionally connected with the death of Jesus (Mark x. 38; Luke xii. 50), although not with the phrase 'with Christ'. Thus, it would be Paul, who in contrast to an understanding of baptism as a mere rising with Christ to a divine life, finally defined it as 'dying with Christ'.

IV. THE THEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE OF PAUL'S VIEW

We started from the observation of the fact that Paul combines very often in the same sentence both the statements just mentioned. According to I Cor. vi. 11, baptism is sanctification and justification at the same time; it is effected in the name of Jesus Christ and in the power of the Spirit. I Thess. v. 10 states that Christ died for us so that we might live with him. II Cor. v. 14 argues that just because he died for us, we all have died, and Rom. vi. 2 ff. runs very much the same way, when it takes for granted that we have definitely died to sin and are walking in a new life, because we are baptized into the vicarious death of Christ. Hence, is not the church's doctrine wrong when it places sanctification and obedience in a new life over against justification by mere faith? We shall therefore ask: (a) is not justification, with Paul, more than a mere act of divine jurisdiction? and (b) is not sanctification, with Paul, more than a mere performance of human good will?

(a) Undoubtedly, it is very important for Paul to emphasize that the foundation of all our living and dying is God's act, and God's act alone. Baptism is baptism into the death of Christ Jesus (Rom. vi. 3). In Rom. viii. 3f. and Gal. iv. 4f. Paul changes a pattern which originally described the incarnation of the pre-existent son, into a proclamation of his death on the cross.¹ There is indeed no other foundation than that which is laid, Jesus Christ, and him crucified (I Cor. iii. 11; ii. 2). And yet, it would be wrong to deduce from these passages a clear legal theory of substitution, of which man should only take cognizance in order to be saved. Even within the one letter to the Romans, Paul uses five or six different images in order to express the importance of Jesus' death for us: that of expiation (iii. 24f.)² or atonement (v. 10f.), that of vicarious (death v. 6–11; xiv. 15, also in the passive voice iv. 25a), that of ransom (viii. 3 parallel to Gal. iv. 4f.; probably also iii. 24; vii. 4), that of judgement over sin (viii. 3) and that of justification (iii. 24–6, etc.). But the death of Christ is also mentioned where Paul speaks of sharing Christ's destiny so that his death becomes our death (vi. 4–6, cf. v. 15–17; II Cor. v. 14) or where he considers Christ's example as effective in the life of the church (xv. 3–5). The abundance of these images shows that we should be wrong in selecting just one of them as *the* Pauline doctrine.

A further reflection may strengthen this point. As long as one deals with the canonical Old and New Testaments only, the idea of vicarious or expiatory

¹ That Gal. iv. 4f. simply takes up the idea of iii. 13 is proved by the mention of the law and the term *ἐξουπαζειν*, which, within Paul's undisputed letters, is restricted to these two passages. In Rom. viii. 3, the phrase *πρὸς ἁμαρτίας*, going back to Lev. ix. 2f.; xii. 6, 8; xiv. 22, 31; xv. 15, 30; xvi. 3, 5; xxiii. 19; also v. 6, 11; vii. 37, is certainly not a later addition, but Paul's reinterpretation of the pattern in the light of Christ's sacrificial death. Cf. E. Schweizer, 'Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der "Sendungsformel"', Gal. iv. 4f., Röm. viii. 3f., Joh. iii. 16f., I Joh. iv. 9', *ZNW*, LVII (1966), 199–210.

² Cf., however, G. Fitzer, 'Der Ort der Versöhnung nach Paulus', *Theologische Zeitschrift*, xxii (1966), 161–83.

death appears in the sacrificial rites of Israel, is taken up in an astonishingly new way in the figure of the servant of God in Isa. liii, and is fulfilled in a definite and comprehensive way in Jesus' death. However, since we have now a better understanding of the inter-testamental period, we have realized how common this idea was in many circles, although no Jew of this time would have thought of a vicarious death for the world, which would include the Gentiles.¹ Thus, when a Jewish Christian preached Jesus dying for the sake of many, it meant nothing extraordinary. His hearers all believed that quite a number of innocent Jewish martyrs did the same. In order to proclaim the uniqueness of this death of Jesus, a preacher needed still other categories in addition to that of expiatory death. He had to say, at the same time, that this vicarious death of Jesus was unique, because it was the eschatological fulfilment of God's history with mankind. This, of course, is exactly what Paul did when he introduced the phrase 'with Christ'. If it is true that this formula goes back to the apocalyptic hope of an eschatological life with Christ, it guards us from dissolving Paul's statements into mere anthropological descriptions. For, more than anything else, the apocalyptic hope of the New Testament for the new creation of the whole world resists a mere existential interpretation. On the one hand, this shows, exactly in the same way as the doctrine of justification by faith does, that our hope lies outside of ourselves, of our experiences, of all the ups and downs of our faith, namely exclusively in God's deed, which will create a new world at the end of the times, and did so, in a proleptic way, in the death and the resurrection of Christ.² On the other hand, it shows that this creation of a new world on Good Friday and Easter was more than a divine decree merely giving a reprieve from all punishment for sins. It urges us to search for new theological categories in order to understand why Paul prefers the concept of living in a new world created by the death and the resurrection of Christ, or under a new lordship inaugurated by these events and anticipating the coming kingdom of God, to any merely anthropological statements.

(b) At the same time, the insight into the roots of the formula 'with Christ' in apocalyptic expectancies warns us against misunderstanding the sanctification and the new life as a human effort. In Phil. iii. 3, Paul writes that we serve God by the Spirit, no longer trusting in the flesh. This means that the Spirit is the real power which is behind all our service to God, whereas the flesh gets its power only if we put our trust in it. Rom. viii. 13f. contrasts those who live *according* to the flesh to those who *by* the Spirit kill the works of the body. Again, the Spirit is the actual power killing all that does not please God, whereas the flesh gets some power only if man chooses it as his standard of life. According to Gal. iv. 23f. one son of Abraham is begotten *according* to (the norms of) the flesh, the other *through* the promise of God. Again, the Spirit is the real begetting power, the flesh is the thing to

¹ Cf. II Macc. vii. 38; IV Macc. i. 11; vi. 29; xvii. 21f.

² Cf. note 1, p. 14.

which Abraham looked first, so that *he* let it dominate him. Never is it the reverse. This means that for Paul the power of the flesh and that of the Spirit are in no way to be seen on the same level. The flesh is a power by the grace of man; it is powerful only as long as man gives it its power, allows it to dominate him. Not so with the Spirit. It—or we should preferably say—*he* is the real power behind all work of the baptized, working in God's power, independently of man. This is, of course, the Old Testament influence, where the contrast to flesh is always God or God's word or God's Spirit. It is hence quite well possible, in the case of flesh, to reduce a mythological Pauline figure of speech to a mere anthropological attitude, since the work or thinking of the 'flesh' is actually the work or thinking of man trusting in the 'flesh', that is, in the created world instead of in the creator. But the same reduction is impossible in the case of Spirit. For the Spirit is, with Paul, always God's own activity, absolutely independent of man, breaking into human existence from outside, as a new power ruling over him not by man's grace, but by his own authority.¹

Is this an additional event which follows that of justification? Should we distinguish the juridical and the mystical statement of Paul by distinguishing two subsequent stages of a Christian life? The three passages from which we started all describe, in the juridical language of atonement or justification, the inauguration of a new lordship. Living under justification by Christ, in the righteousness of God, means living under the lordship of Christ, in the life of the Spirit. Justification by the death of Christ, therefore, means, for Paul, always the conquest of man by the authority of the Spirit. With E. Käsemann,² I think indeed that the righteousness of God is interpreted correctly by the category of 'power'. It is the act which transfers man from the lordship of the Flesh, which is ultimately the lordship of his own will, to that of Christ, exercised by the Spirit.

¹ Cf. E. Schweizer, in Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, vii, 131, 20ff.

² 'Gottesgerechtigkeit bei Paulus', in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, II (1964), 181–93. I should think that this category, used also extensively in Tannehill (cf. note 1, p. 1), e.g. pp. 14–20, 123–9, is more adequate to Paul's thinking than either Thüsing's or Güttgemann's stimulating new formulations (cf. note 1, p. 1). The former emphasizes the corporate body of the exalted Lord, to be conceived of in ontological terms, into which the believer is transferred in the sacrament (for Rom. vi especially pp. 67–93, 134–43). However, his understanding of the life of the exalted Christ as directed towards God so that sharing it means sharing a life of obedience in which God becomes the only goal (262f.), comes rather near to Käsemann's concept, and is a real progress in Pauline interpretation. The latter's emphasis on the Christological aspect of Paul's theology (203–6, for Rom. vi cf. 212f.) is certainly helpful. He also rightly opposes a merely mythological concept of the body of the risen Lord (e.g. 330–44). But I doubt whether his stress on the 'eschatological' character of the time of Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection which bridges the gap between A.D. 30 and today, is sufficient for explaining Paul's view (cf. e.g. 118–21, 195–8, 222f.). His strict denial of a concept of an individual body of the risen Lord (247–70) or of the apostle's membership in the body of Christ (323) does not seem to do justice to the texts.

V. THE UNITY OF THE 'JURIDICAL' AND THE
'MYSTICAL' LINE IN PAUL'S THEOLOGY

This, I suppose, explains our first observation, namely the fact that the idea of Christ dying for our sake and that of our living with him or our sharing his death with him, or our life in the realm of the Spirit, appear in the same sentence. Let me try to clarify my position by very shortly pointing to three outstanding pericopes at the beginning, at the end and in the middle of the letter to the Romans, and by finally summarizing my view.

The first pericope is Rom. iii. 21–6. Paul certainly uses traditional vocabulary, whether or not he actually quotes a creed or liturgical formula, as Käsemann thinks. No less certain is the fact that Paul's own interpretation is to be found, first of all, in the emphasis which he puts on faith and the gratuitous gift of God's grace which does not demand the works of the law. Faith, however, is not simply the attitude of individual men; it came, according to Gal. iii. 23–5, into the world as a power superseding that of the Mosaic law. Without dealing with the numerous exegetical problems, we realize that the event of the righteousness of God inaugurates a new 'time', a new aeon. The period of God's holding back his judgement¹ has definitely come to its end.

It is the law of faith which rules, and no longer the law of works, according to Paul's own exegesis in *v.* 27. As, after the victory of the allied forces in France, the law of the victors ruled over the country and no longer the law of the German occupation force, whether one realized it or not; so God's righteousness rules now over the world, whether one realizes it or not.

The second text is Rom. xv. 1–6. The introduction in *v.* 1, generalizing the concrete admonitions of ch. xiv, and the phrases 'for the common good' and 'for edification', both important for Paul and well known from I Cor. xii. 7, xiv. 3–5, show that this pericope is a kind of summary. The life of the church in mutual love is, according to *v.* 3, founded in the behaviour of Christ, who is described with a quotation from a psalm of the suffering righteous. This means that the passion of Christ, as the eschatological fulfilment of the Old Testament, is the foundation of the church's life, which, as verses 5 and 6 say, is now dominated by hope and praise of the Lord. Above all, it is a being 'of one mind' or 'thinking unanimously' of all 'according to Christ Jesus'. Paul does not write 'as with Christ Jesus' or anything similar. He formulates 'to think unanimously according to Christ Jesus', parallel to his phrase 'to live according to the Spirit'. This means that Christ is not simply an example to be followed. He is at least the standard according to which the church lives,

¹ I understand ἀνοχή as it is understood in ii. 4, and interpret πάρεσις as a provisional allowing to pass, not identical with ἄφεσις. Hence the formerly committed sins are those which had been committed before Christ's death.

but, as in the case of the other phrase 'according to the Spirit', the meaning is rather comprehensive and includes the actual cause of such a life.¹

Thus both texts, seemingly contradictory to each other, describe the change of the ruling power which transposes the church into the new righteousness of God and the new obedience of his people. Whereas, at the beginning of the letter, the stress is laid upon God's act not merited by any work of man, it is, at the end, laid upon the new situation of the church created by God's act.

This is buttressed by the third section, Rom. viii. 2–4. Here also, the change of the ruling power is central for Paul. In Christ Jesus, the law of the revivifying Spirit has superseded that of sin and death. It has done this because God has judged sin in the flesh of Christ, sacrificed on the cross.² And it has done this with the aim that the demands of the law should be fulfilled in those who, from now on, would live according to the spirit. Paul neither writes 'for those' nor 'by those' but 'in those'. Again, the 'juridical' statement that God let Christ die for our sake is identified with the 'mystical' statement that, by this, God has transplanted men into the realm of the Spirit, by whom the demands of the law are fulfilled in the believers. Again justification and sanctification cannot be separated; again the name of Jesus Christ, dying for the sake of the church, and the power of the Spirit, working in the church, cannot be separated.

Does this not mean that the contrast between imputed and effective justification or between a merely cognitive and a magically effective significance of baptism is somehow wrong? Should we not search for new theological categories? When God created the world, his word was identical with his deed. It is the same in the new creation. And yet, creating or new-creating is not identical with practising magic. It puts man under a new power, a new lordship, and it puts him by this into a new responsibility, where obedience is the only possible answer. When, to take up this example again, the allied forces took over control in France, it was a historical fact which could be dated exactly. Yet it was not an objective fact in the same sense as, for instance, the falling of a meteor in Siberia. This is true whether anyone realizes it or not and may, for centuries, not affect anybody. A lordship, however, is always lordship over men. They may know or not know about it, they may like or dislike or even hate it; it changes their lives from the very first moment. Whatever they do becomes, by the mere fact of the newly exercised authority of the ruling power, obedience or disobedience, co-operation or rebellion. There is, of course, no lordship without a people. Thus, the lordship of Christ is a fact since Easter and has changed the world,

¹ I Cor. xii. 8f. διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος is totally synonymous with κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα. Very similar is it in Rom. viii. 4–9 (cf. 13f.), and in Rom. i. 4 κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα designates the sphere which determines the new, heavenly existence of Christ. Cf. also Thüsing (cf. note 1, p. 1), pp. 39–45.

² Cf. note 2, p. 9.

once for all. And yet it is, at the same time, still changing the world, since it creates obedience (or disobedience), new love (or hatred), devotion (or aggression) ever anew.¹ By taking up the traditional phrases for Christ's vicarious death, Paul keeps his readers from a mere existential understanding, in which the conversion of the believer, his engagement and his decision would become central. By taking up the traditional phrase of apocalyptic hope, Paul keeps his readers from a mere existential understanding, in which the new self-understanding of man, his attitude, his faith would become central. In 'juridical' and 'mystical' vocabulary Paul stresses *God's* act in Jesus and in the Spirit as the only foundation and the only reality of all new life.² And yet exactly this act claims and creates man's faith. Faith finds its certitude on God's deed, and just by doing so and by expecting everything from him becomes obedience. Such obedience gives way to the work of the Spirit and leaves him the space occupied hitherto by man's own works.

¹ We cannot deal here with the difficult problem of the relation of the 'once for all' of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection to the 'once for him' of the individual baptism. For Paul, the establishment of the Lordship of Christ clearly took place around the year A.D. 30 in Palestine, although it becomes valid for us in our baptism as the beginning of our faith.

² A last image may illustrate Paul's emphasis. If I want to know about a performance of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, I must ask somebody who was present. A totally 'objective' observer might tell me that 250 electric bulbs were burning, etc. Thus, I must ask somebody who really got engaged. If, however, this one told me merely about his subjective experiences ('I tell you, I had tears in my eyes during the second act, and my heart was beating wildly during the third...') he would not help me at all, since I want to know what happened on the stage and not in the hearts of the audience. Therefore, the witnesses of the New Testament, just because they are totally engaged, do not tell us about their own engagement, but about God's deeds.